

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 349 053

JC 920 441

AUTHOR Spencer, Patricia A.; Flyr, Mary L.
TITLE The Formal Evaluation as an Impetus to Classroom Change: Myth or Reality?
PUB DATE 92
NOTE 30p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Change Agents; Classroom Environment; College Faculty; Community Colleges; Evaluation Research; *Evaluation Utilization; *Faculty Evaluation; Higher Education; *Instructional Improvement; Peer Evaluation; State Universities; Student Evaluation of Teacher Performance; *Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Improvement; *Tenured Faculty; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted to determine the effects of the formal evaluation process (FEP) of two- and four-year college faculty on instructional improvement. A questionnaire was mailed to a random sample of 250 tenured faculty representing five colleges and universities. Respondents were asked to indicate whether three segments of the FEP (i.e., student, peer, and administrator evaluation) had led to changes in such areas as teaching strategies, classroom management, and basic philosophies of education. In addition, faculty perceptions of the FEP were gathered through four questions utilizing a Likert scale and one open-ended query. Survey findings, based on a 58% response rate, included the following: (1) of the three FEP segments, respondents were most likely to use student feedback as an impetus for change, but only in specific areas such as altering handout materials, changing the number of assignments, and changing the pacing of lectures; (2) 77% of the responses indicated that student evaluations were not taken into account; (3) 8% of the responses indicated that peer review had led to changes, mostly in the area of selecting a different textbook; (4) administrator feedback was credited as an impetus for change in only 2% of the responses; (5) 25% of changes were attributed to "other causes"; and (6) 73% of the respondents indicated that the FEP never or only occasionally lead to instructional improvement, and 64% indicated that follow-up support to assist in implementing change was never provided. A literature review, faculty responses, and recommendations are included in the study report. Contains 40 references. (MAB)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED349053

The Formal Evaluation as an Impetus to Classroom Change:

Myth or Reality?

Patricia A. Spencer

Riverside Community College

Mary L. Flyr

University of California, Riverside

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

P. A. Spencer

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

JL 920441

Abstract

The formal evaluation of 2- and 4-year college and university faculty is a well-established practice based in contractual agreement. The actual procedure is diverse and varies from institution to institution, from discipline to discipline, and even from instructor to instructor. A multitude of perceived purposes is attributed to formal evaluation: tenure, dismissal, promotion, merit pay, pay increases, tracking publication, and creating change in the form of improved instruction. Colleges and universities incorporate, but are not limited to, three segments within the formal evaluation process (FEP): student, peer, and administrative. This study focuses on the capability of the FEP to serve as an effective format and process that teachers will use to create changes that lead to improvement of instruction. Results indicate that the FEP, as currently practiced by public 2- and 4-year colleges and universities, does not incorporate the elements necessary to provide a process which faculty will utilize to improve classroom instruction and some of the reasons are examined. In addition, the participants of the process do not agree as to what are the goals of the FEP and what end the process should serve.

Introduction

The formal evaluation of 2- and 4-year college and university faculty is a well-established practice based in contractual agreement. The actual procedure is diverse and varies from institution to institution, from discipline to discipline, and even from instructor to instructor. A multitude of perceived purposes is attributed to formal evaluation: tenure, dismissal, promotion, merit pay, pay increases, tracking publication, and creating change in the form of improved instruction. Colleges and universities incorporate, but are not limited to, three segments within the formal evaluation process: student, peer, and administrative. This study focuses on the capability of the formal evaluation process (FEP) to create change in the form of improved instruction. It examines whether the FEP provides an effective format and process that teachers use to create change in their classrooms. Teacher perceptions of the process as an effective tool to address concerns of improvement of instruction are investigated. No attempt is made to study the other perceived purposes or aspects of the FEP.

Literature Review

Boston schools as far back as the early 1800's were "inspected" by committees of lay persons to determine whether instructional goals were being met. The inspection

function has developed into an in-house procedure mandated for all teachers.

The tool used to record observations from such inspections "in almost all formal evaluations of teaching since the early twentieth century has been the teacher rating scale" (Medley, 1987). The first of such devices to be published appeared in 1915 in the yearbook of the National Society for the Study of Education. This rating scale consisted of 45 items which allowed the observer to rate teacher behaviors (Medley, 1987). These rating scales have changed over time, however, ratings from participants of each of the three segments has at one time or another been credited and discredited as the part of the process most likely to lead to improvement of instruction (Cashin, 1988; Centra, 1977; Medley, 1987; Mellow, 1984).

Student evaluations are the most commonly used instrument for faculty evaluation (Seldin, 1984). An overview of research on student ratings supports their use indicating that:

...average student ratings are (a) multidimensional; (b) reliable and stable; (c) primarily a function of the instructor who teaches a course rather than the course that is taught; (d) relatively valid against a variety of indicators of effective teaching; (e) relatively unaffected by a variety of variables hypothesized as potential biases; and (f) seen to be useful by

faculty as feedback about their teaching, by students for use in course selection, and by administrators for use in personnel decisions (Cashin, 1988).

Cohen's 1980 meta-analysis of 22 studies on the effectiveness of student-rating feedback showed a moderate effect on improving instruction. Feedback raised the instructor's end-of-term overall rating by .16 of a rating point, or over 1/3 of a standard deviation. However, a ten-year study from 1970 to 1980 of the mathematics department at Rhode Island College found "no evidence that the use of student evaluations produced improved rating over the decade..." (Salzberg & Schiller, 1982).

The validity of student feedback is suspect since providing low ratings for faculty may be seen as a potential for receiving low grades. In addition, students have little experience in making judgments about competency. Nor do they have formal training in how to teach or how to do an evaluation of teaching. W. James Popham writes, "...students' estimates of a teacher's instructional skill are often contaminated by the teacher's popularity or the students' interest in the subject matter being taught" (1988).

Peer ratings based on actual classroom visitations are often proposed as indicators of effective teaching and hence a criterion for validating students' evaluation. "When teachers are asked what person/role they find most credible

In their field, they unanimously reply, "another teacher-- not the principal, not the college professor, not the consultant. So teachers essentially believe other teachers, when it comes to 'instruction'" (Mellow, 1984).

Ward, Clark, and Harrison (1981) also suggest a methodological problem with the collection of peer ratings in that the presence of a colleague in the classroom affects the classroom performance of the instructor and provides a threat to the external validity of the procedure. In addition, Weinbach & Randolph (1984) write that faculty are reluctant to use peer evaluation to create instructional change due to the "lack of trust in one's colleagues and/or skepticism regarding their ability to evaluate teaching competency objectively".

Various studies point to the department chairperson as the most important individual consulted to assess teaching for administrative purposes in almost all types of institutions. "Historically, deans or directors have carried major responsibility for tenure and promotion decisions in professional education..." (Centra, 1977). Tenure and eventual promotion were a reasonable expectation for faculty members who did their job, 'paid their dues' and did not cause embarrassment to the college or university" (Weinbach & Randolph, 1984).

A nationwide survey of accredited 4-year undergraduate, liberal arts colleges, found that the quality of classroom

teaching was seen by 98% of the responding deans as the single most important consideration in evaluating performance (Seldin, 1983). However, in An Artistic Approach to Supervision Elliot Eisner describes the difficulty administrators may encounter in evaluating teaching effectiveness:

The one-shot, 40-minute visit severely constrains what a supervisor is able to do, if for no other reason than the problem of establishing rapport. Furthermore, the aspects of teaching that need modification might be due to habits and needs that simple feedback is unlikely to alter. Our most ingrained habits, the things we do because of the kinds of needs we have, are not likely to be changed by a brief conversation or a paragraph or two of recommendations prepared by a supervisor. Such change requires substantial attention and support (1982).

Oliva (1988) writes of the barriers to change which may inhibit the inability of the FEP to create change:

- 1) fear of change on the part of those likely to be affected,
- 2) lack of clear goals, and
- 3) lack of competent leadership.

The FEP is perceived by many faculty as a judgement of their worth that may lead to demands for change. The first barrier to change, an element of fear, is inherent in such a

Judgement. Cogan conducted several studies of teacher supervision which provided basis for his conclusion that "psychologically [supervision] is almost inevitably viewed as an active threat to the teacher, possibly endangering his professional standing and undermining his confidence" (1961). In general, any willingness to accept and/or implement change "requires a certain level of commitment and security before we can take risks. As humans, we fear the unknown and the status quo, although perhaps imperfect, is at least safe and known...." (McCutcheon, 1988).

The second barrier to change is a lack of clear goals. No definition of effective teaching is established at the onset of evaluation. "No standard task to be performed by the teacher is defined, no record of behavior is made, and the procedure used to assign numbers to the various elements of performance rated is completely subjective" (Medley, 1987). The criteria for evaluation should "rest ultimately upon knowledge of what the teacher is trying to accomplish..." (Medley, 1987), but the FEP fails to provide a process in which the individual teacher communicates his/her goals and purposes to the committee prior to the measurement of the effectiveness of achieving those goals and purposes.

Factor analyses of the ratings gathered in Medley's research indicate that the raters are influenced by the Halo Effect in that the ratings they assign to individual

teachers are derived from a general impression of teacher competency (1987). This general impression stems from a composite of impressions formulated from how a teacher behaves in teachers meetings, secondhand information from student evaluations, comments from colleagues, and status position within the school culture.

The third barrier to change is the lack of competent leadership. Medley points out further problems with the gathering of credible information in that "the raters, whether administrators, peers, or students, are rarely given adequate training in performing these feats; nor are they selected with any particular care" (1987). To facilitate evaluation leading to improvement of instruction the "leader must be knowledgeable about the process of effecting change and be able to implement that knowledge with the group" (Oliva, 1988).

However, a simple removal of these barriers does not guarantee change. Change occurs in a process incorporating three elements:

- 1) awareness that the new knowledge will satisfy a need or desire the individual has,
- 2) new behavior must be reinforced with feedback, and
- 3) change must be supported by others.

Mellow (1984) writes, "...the first step toward making any change is a recognition or awareness on the part of an individual that the new knowledge, practice or skill will,

in fact, satisfy a need or desire the individual has." He further writes, "The notion that just because I tell you something that I believe to be important will somehow change your behavior is nonsense. Rather, if what I tell you is perceived by you as meeting some need you have, then, perhaps, you will consider making a change in that direction."

The second element of change requires that the new behavior be reinforced with feedback. Feedback that can be used by teachers to create change in their classrooms "...is perceived as a continuous, cyclical process" (Oliva, 1988), rather than the "one-shot" evaluation described by Eisner (1982).

The third element of change is the notion that "support from others with respect to the new behavior will reinforce that behavior and will further motivate us to continue to move in the direction of the new behavior" (Mellow, 1984). Material and emotional support from peers, students, and administrators contribute to the ability of individual teachers to make and sustain changes in their classrooms.

Evaluation itself must be evaluated to determine if it provides for the elements of change. This study is an evaluation of the formal evaluation process investigating the myth that this process serves as an impetus to instructional change.

Methodology

A mailed questionnaire was distributed to a random sample of 250 tenured faculty representing five colleges and universities. An overall response rate of 58 percent was realized with an across campus range of 48-80 percent.

The questionnaire contained ten questions that operationalized change in the classroom. Each question addressed the general categories of classroom change such as teaching strategies and techniques, classroom management, and basic philosophies of education. Respondents were instructed to indicate the segment of the FEP that had most led to change in their classrooms. The segments listed were Student, Peer, Administrative, Other Causes, and No Changes. Caution was given to consider the evaluation experience since gaining tenure.

In addition, four questions that utilized a Likert Scale to rate responses of Never, Occasionally, Usually, and Always were included to gather data on faculty perceptions concerning the institutional goals, feeling of apprehensiveness and defensiveness, usefulness of feedback, and provision of support to use the information gained in the process to create change in their classrooms.

One open-ended question inquired into the type of input respondents had in structuring their own evaluation process. A second question asked for faculty perceptions of the goal of the FEP at their institution and whether the goal was

met. The concluding comment provided space for faculty to elaborate.

Results

Cumulative Responses to Operationalized Questions

The histogram (Figure 1) provides a picture of response patterns to all ten questions. It illustrates responses to individual questions of which segment of the FEP faculty utilize to create change in the classroom.

Insert Figure 1--See page 29

Table 1

Cumulative Faculty Responses by F.E.P. Segments

<u>Segments</u>	<u>Percentages</u>
Student	23
Peer	8
Administrative	2
Other Causes	25
No Changes	40
No Response	2

Student Feedback as an Impetus to Change

Of the three segments of the FEP respondents report they are more likely to use student feedback as an impetus

for change (Table 1). Responses indicate that the types of change attributed to student feedback fall in the areas of altering handout materials, changing number of assignments, and changing presentation habits such as pacing and verbal pauses. Student feedback appears to have little impact on basic philosophy of education or grading policies (Figure 1).

One professor offers comments that substantiate his selective use of student feedback, "...our process here is far too much of a popularity contest and far too little a helpful evaluation stressing concrete proposals for more effective teaching. However, some students do provide good ideas!" Another professor expressed the view that "less than one out of 100 student evaluations makes a useful suggestion. Probably not worth the effort."

Seventy-seven percent of responses reveal nonuse of student feedback to make changes in classrooms. Various faculty elaborate on the reasons for not valuing student feedback. A community college professor states, "As you know, the formal evaluation process for students of professors, came out of the protest movement of the 1960s. It does not work. Never has worked. How can students, particularly at the community college level, evaluate professors. They are in a position to gain knowledge. Many are below C average, intellectually lacking, hostile, sexist, and, yes, even racist. Who are they to judge?" A

state university professor stated, "...students can point out obvious deficiencies but lack the experience to evaluate critical areas. I have spent many years serving on evaluation committees, including a stint as dean. It's difficult work. Teaching is especially hard to evaluate....I receive good, better than good, student evaluations, but I think they have come to play too large a role in evaluations. Too many superficial but popular and well-organized teachers are rewarded".

Peer Feedback as an Impetus to Change

Compared to student, the peer category indicates a smaller incidence of use (Table 1). The 8 percent response across campuses in the peer category reflects individual campus responses which range from 3 to 11 percent. The greatest use of peer feedback (14 percent) falls in the area of selecting a different textbook. However, even in this category teachers credit change more often to either Other Causes (36 percent) or make No Change (28 percent).

Elaborative comments of faculty from all five campuses illuminate possible reasons for the limited use of peer feedback. Faculty perceive peer feedback procedures as "problematic" and as a "possible violation of academic freedom." Peer review was described as, "...less than candid," "...rather generous" and "...often abused based on the 'Buddy' system".

Administrative Feedback As An Impetus To Change

While the FEP serves as a contractual administrative tool to improve instruction, responses indicate that teachers do not use the feedback as such (Table 1). Administrative feedback is credited as an impetus to change in the classroom in only 2 percent of all possible categories and questions. Administrative input that has some influence for teachers is utilized in rewriting syllabi and implementing new testing techniques. However, this influence is supported by only a 3 percent response rate.

Not one cumulative score arises in the survey tool where the administrative input is most often credited as the impetus to change. Faculty comments supporting nonuse include, "The evaluation process in the hands of a vindictive dean is an exquisite instrument of torture" and "On my next to last evaluation, I believe management's primary goal was to intimidate and punish me". Further comments from faculty indicate their perception of the FEP as being "an exercise for managers", effective in meeting "administrative needs", and a way of "satisfying political pressures from Sacramento", rather than a means of addressing teacher concerns. Or as one university professor stated, the FEP serves "to keep administration happy."

Other Causes

Twenty-five percent of responses fell under the survey heading Other Causes (Table 1) indicating support for the notion that influence outside the FEP may be more likely

than even the student segment to lead to change in the classroom.

Comments from faculty suggest other causes for change. "Essentially it comes down to one's own pride rather than any effects from [the three segments of the FEP]", wrote a community college teacher. "My classroom changes have been considerable, but they are self-initiated," reports a university professor. "I happen to enjoy the craft of teaching and need improvement in my methods and procedures. The formal evaluation received does not help in this because, according to it I am (always have been) doing more than satisfactory work as a teacher." A colleague supports the concept by writing, "I took responsibility and initiated changes because I perceived the need for them." A community college teacher states, "I have made several changes to my approach to teaching classes, but almost never as a result of the formal evaluation process." While not unanimous, at all five colleges Other Causes appears to be more likely than any one segment of the FEP to lead to change in the classroom.

No Changes

A total of 40 percent, the largest number of responses, falls in the category of No Changes (Table 1). The question of faculty interpretation of this question must be addressed. As researchers, we are uncertain whether the question was answered as "I make no changes in the

classroom" or simply "I make no changes due to the FEP." We report personal comments of faculty for your own interpretation.

Professors from both community colleges and universities write, "There is a significant amount of 'dead wood' on this campus" and that "far too many tenured full profs become lax in their performance and there is little the process can do to affect improvements." One university professor reports having "never been asked or told to make changes" within the process of evaluation. Another describes formal evaluation as "...virtually useless for aiding classroom improvement, since it is used for judgements about advancement." Comments from four community college teachers agree with this perception by writing, "actually with the current tenure system, our evaluation process is virtually useless", a "joke", a "worthless effort!" and summed up as the "evaluation here is a meaningless process."

Comparison Of A Dichotomy

In Table 2 the results of the survey are analyzed according to a dichotomy of the segments of the FEP--Student/Peer/Administrative compared to Other Causes/No Changes (Table 2). Thirty-three percent of responses fall within the three segments of the FEP compared to 65 percent falling outside the realm of the instrument. Arrangement of the categories in this manner illustrates that perhaps

something other than the FEP is more likely to lead to improvement of instruction through change in the classroom.

TABLE 2

Response by Dichotomous Arrangement

Percent Accredited To FEP		Percent Not Accredited To FEP	
Student	23	Other Causes	25
Peer	8	No Changes	40
Administrative	2		
Total	33		65
*No Response	2		

Teachers Perceptions

Teacher responses to four additional questions are reported below. Intent is to provide greater dimension to the rationale for an individual teacher's use or nonuse of the FEP as an improvement of instruction tool.

- 1) Do you feel the formal evaluation process addresses concerns of instructional improvement?

Seventy-three percent of the respondents indicate that the process never or only occasionally serves as an improvement of instruction process, with 27 percent regarding the process as usually or always addressing concerns of instructional improvement.

- 2) Do you experience feelings of apprehension or defensiveness during the formal process?

Seventy percent of the respondents indicate experiencing feelings of apprehension or defensiveness during the FEP. Only 28 percent reported never feeling apprehension or defensiveness during the process. Two percent did not respond.

3) Have the results of your evaluation provided feedback that you could use for improvement?

Eighty percent of faculty report that they either never or only occasionally receive feedback that they can utilize. Two percent of the responses report that they always receive input that could lead to improvement of instruction.

4) Is follow-up support provided to assist you in making changes in the classroom?

Sixty-four percent of faculty responses indicate that follow-up support is never provided to assist with the implementation of change that might derive from the FEP. Nineteen percent report occasionally, and 10 percent report usually receiving assistance. Only 3 percent of faculty always receive assistance in the process of making changes as called for in the FEP.

Conclusions and Recommendations

Teacher responses indicate that the FEP, as typically practiced in 2- and 4-year colleges and universities, is unlikely to serve as an impetus to classroom change. Faculty response patterns in each individual segment, as well as the cumulative impact of the process itself,

document faculty nonuse of the FEP. If a formal evaluation process (1) lacks clear goals, fosters fear and defensiveness, (2) is deficient in providing support for change, (3) is conducted by evaluators considered insufficiently trained in evaluation, and (4) is perceived as ineffective by faculty, then the process is unlikely to be effective as an improvement of instruction tool. Under these circumstances, rather than serving the intended purpose of creating more effective teachers, use of the FEP tends to result in the establishment of minimum standards for teacher performance.

To develop a formal evaluation process that will facilitate improvement of instruction, the effect of nonsupport for initiation of change must be addressed. Literature on change, educational management, and on the evaluation process itself notes that support is critical to the success of a teacher's ability to create and sustain change in his/her teaching environment, techniques, or policies. While 78 percent of faculty respondents at least occasionally received feedback they could use for improvement of instruction, 64 percent stated that support for such improvement is never forthcoming. As teachers come to know and understand the social system and bureaucratic policies of a school, they learn whether support will be provided to assist the creation of change. When the culture of the school withholds support for the individual teacher

In their own efforts to improve in their work, it is soon known by all the workers. Teachers will not continue to ask for that which is not forthcoming. Therefore, the stimulus to initiate change is diminished. A funneling phenomenon occurs as administrative attitudes flow down to the teachers, reinforcing the futility of attempting change. To become effective in helping teachers, rather than being scheduled to meet institutional needs of assessment, the FEP should be designed to provide the continuous, non-judgmental feedback that supports a teacher's efforts to create and sustain change.

Responses also indicate that the participants of the process do not agree as to what are the goals of the FEP and what end the process should serve. Teachers report a variety of process goals: tenure, pay raises, legal requirements and political pressure, a general check up system for administrators to keep faculty in line, retention of faculty sympathetic to administration, administrative removal of disliked individuals, administrative control over teacher behaviors, punishment, a "paper-show" of concern for improvement of instruction, busy work, real or imagined pressure from the community, no educational goal, a pro forma act. A smaller number of teachers identify dismissal of incompetent teachers and improvement of instruction as the intended goal. The majority of those who do state the goal as improvement of instruction qualify their comments by

adding that the goal is rarely met. Establishment of goals and definition of the purpose of evaluation are recommended if the process is to serve as an improvement of instruction tool.

The problems surrounding the use of the peer review segment of the FEP may be difficult to resolve in a formal process upon which hinge such a great number of important contingencies as promotion, pay, retention, and tenure. In the past, the FEP has been accepted as a safeguard for quality education, a means of improving even the most effective teachers. However, improvement necessitates change. The FEP is ill-equipped to effectuate change as it contains all the barriers and none of the essential elements of change. No longer can educators perpetuate the myth that the FEP leads to instructional improvement. Teachers and administrators together must take a pro-active position to create a process that will be used to meet the goal of improvement of instruction.

References

- Acheson, K. A., & Gall, M. D. (1987). Techniques in the clinical supervision of teachers (2nd ed.). White Plains, New York: Longman Inc.
- Balrd, J. R. (1989, March). Intellectual and methodological imperative for individual teacher development. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA.
- Berlin, B. L., & Jensen, K. (1989). Changing teachers. Education and Urban Society, 22, 115-123.
- Blackburn, R. T., & Clark, M. J. (1975). An assessment of faculty performance: Some correlates between administrators, colleagues, student, and self-ratings. Sociology of Education, 48, 242-256.
- Cashin, W. E. (1988, September). Student ratings of teaching: A summary of the research. (Idea Paper No. 20). Kansas State University: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development Division of Continuing Education.
- Cashin, W. E. (1990, January) Student ratings of teaching: recommendations for use. (Idea Paper No. 22). Kansas State University: Center for Faculty Evaluation and Development Division of Continuing Education.
- Centra, J. A. (1979). Determining faculty effectiveness: assessing teaching research and service for personnel

- decisions and improvement. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Chin, R., & Downey, L. (1973). Changing change: Innovating a discipline. In R.M.W. Travers (Ed.), Second Handbook of Research on Teaching. Chicago: Rand McNally & Co.
- Cohen, P. A. (1980). Effectiveness of student rating feedback for improving college instruction: A meta-analysis of findings. Research in Higher Education, 13, 321-341.
- Cogan, M. L. (1961). Supervision at the Harvard-Newton summer school. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Graduate School of Education.
- Cranton, P., & Smith R. A. (1990). Reconsidering the unit of analysis: A model of student ratings of instruction. Journal of Educational Psychology, 82 (2), 207-212.
- Duzo, J., & Florini, B. (1984). Evaluating instructional development projects: Guidance from the literature on change. (Report No. IR 013 303). In: Instructional Development: The State of the Art, II. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 298 918)
- Elsner, E. (1982). An artistic approach to supervision. In T. J. Sergiovanni (Ed.), Supervision of Teaching. ASCD 1982 Yearbook (p. 61). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Feldman, K. A. (1983). Seniority and experience of college teachers as related to evaluations they receive from

- students. Research in Higher Education, 18, 3-69.
- Gill, D. H. (1987). Instructional evaluation as a feedback process. In L.M. Alemomoni (Ed.), New directions for teaching and learning: Vol. 31. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Hollingsworth, S. (1989). Prior beliefs and cognitive change in learning to teach. American Educational Research Journal, 26, 160-189.
- Hunter M. (1985). What's wrong with Madeline Hunter? Educational Leadership, 42, 57-60.
- Kort, M. S. (Spring, 1990). No more band-aids: Adult learning and faculty development. ADE Bulletin, 95, 21-24.
- Marsh, H. W. (1984). Students evaluations of university teaching: Dimensionality, reliability, validity, potential biases, and utility. Journal of Educational Psychology, 76, 707-754.
- McCutcheon, G. (1985). Curriculum theory/curriculum practice: A gap or the Grand Canyon? In A. Molnar (Ed.), Current Thought on Curriculum, 1985 Yearbook. Alexandria Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 46.
- McKnight, P. (April, 1986). Beyond the questionnaires and the data: Developing a model of faculty evaluation. Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Education Research Association, San Francisco,

California.

Medley, D. M. (1987). Criteria for evaluating teaching. In M.J. Dunkin (Ed.), The International Encyclopedia of Teaching and Teacher Education pp. 169-190.

Australia: Pergamon Press.

Mello, L. T. (1984). Peer-centered coaching: Teachers helping teachers to improve classroom performance. (Report No. SP 028-123). Idaho Springs, CO: Associates for Human Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 274 648)

Munro, P. & Elliott, J. (1987). Instructional growth through peer teaching (Report No. SP 028 493). (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 617)

Murphy, C. (Date Unknown). Colleague coaching: What makes it work? (Contract No. NIE-G-80-0103.). Washington D.C.: National Institute of Education.

Murray, H. G. (1982, August). Use of student instructional ratings in administrative personnel decisions at the University of Western Ontario. Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, D.C.

Oliva, P. F. (1988). Developing the Curriculum (2nd ed.). Glenview, Illinois: Scott, Foresman and Company.

Palmer, P. P. (1990, January/February). Good teaching: a matter of living the mystery. Change, 11-16.

Popham, W. J. (1988). Educational Evaluation (2nd ed.)

- Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Pulich, M. A. (1984). Better use of student evaluations for teaching effectiveness. Improving College and University Teaching, 32 (2), 91-94.
- Ramsey, R. S. (1980). The effect of evaluative feedback from students on faculty performance at the University of Mississippi (Doctoral dissertation, University of Mississippi, 1980). Dissertation Abstracts International, 41/1A, 4622.
- Salzberg, H. F., & Schiller, B. (1982). A decade of student evaluations. College Student Journal, 16, 84-88.
- Seldin, P. (1984). Changing practices in faculty evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1982). Supervision of Teaching. ASCD 1982 Yearbook. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.
- Stodolsky, S. S. (November, 1984). Teacher evaluation: the limits of looking. Educational Researcher, 11-18.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. (1970, June). Educational evaluation and decision making. Address to the 11th Annual Phi Delta Kapa Symposium on Educational Research. Ohio State University.
- Stufflebeam, D. L. et al. (1971). Educational Evaluation and Decision Making. Itasca, IL: Peacock.
- Ward, M. D., Clark, D. C., & Harrison, G. V. (1981, April). The observer effect in classroom visitation.

Unpublished paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Los Angeles, California.

Weinback, R. W., & Randolph, J. L. (1984). Peer review for tenure and promotion in professional schools. Improving College and University Teaching, 32 (2), 81-86.

Wiles, K. (1967). Supervision for Better Schools (3rd ed.). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Evaluation Leading to Classroom Change

SURVEY RESULTS

